

LIBRARY  
MICH

PR

SEP 29 '44

# THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. XI, NO. 272

SEPTEMBER 10, 1944

## *In this issue*

A HISTORIC PROMISE OF TOLERANCE: *Address by Assistant Secretary*

*Berle* ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

FOOD AS A FACET IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE: *By Leroy D.*

*Stinebower* ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

WARTIME VISA-CONTROL PROCEDURE: *By Graham H. Stuart* ☆

THE AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE IN TROPICAL AFRICA:

*By Perry N. Jester* ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
**BULLETIN**

VOL. XI • No. 272



PUBLICATION 2176

September 10, 1944

*The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Research and Publication, Office of Public Information, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest is included.*

*Publications of the Department, cumulative lists of which are published at the end of each quarter, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.*

*The BULLETIN, published with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., to whom all purchase orders, with accompanying remittance, should be sent. The subscription price is \$2.75 a year; a single copy is 10 cents.*

# Contents

## AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Brazilian Independence Day: Message of President Roosevelt.....	Page 278
Visit of Mexican Authority on Indian Affairs.....	282
Visit of Judge Venturino of Chile.....	282

## EUROPE

Liberation of Brussels.....	
Statement by the President.....	253
Statement by the Secretary of State.....	253
Political Advisers to General Eisenhower: Statement by the Secretary of State.....	254
Fifth Anniversary of the German Attack on Poland.....	263
Declaration Concerning Czechoslovak Army.....	263

## FAR EAST

Theodore P. Dykstra Returns From China.....	281
---	-----

## NEAR EAST

The Greek Resistance Groups: Statement by the Secretary of State.....	253
---	-----

## ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Suggested Curb on Cartels: Letter From the President to the Secretary of State.....	254
Twenty-Sixth International Labor Conference: Report by the Chairman of the American Delegation.....	258
Food as a Facet in International Trade: By Leroy D. Stinebower.....	264

## GENERAL

A Historic Promise of Tolerance: Address by Assistant Secretary Berle.....	256
Exchange of American and German Nationals.....	278

## POST-WAR MATTERS

A Common Policy for Peace and Security: Letters Exchanged Between Governor Dewey and Secretary Hull.....	255
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration: American Delegation to the Second Session of the Council.....	255
International Peace and Security Organization: Meetings.....	263

## TREATY INFORMATION

Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic.....	284
Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.....	284

## THE DEPARTMENT

Wartime Visa-Control Procedure: By Graham H. Stuart.....	271
Functions of the International Information Division.....	283
Appointment of Officers.....	284

## THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Consular Offices.....	262
The American Foreign Service in Tropical Africa: By Perry N. Jester.....	279

PUBLICATIONS.....	282
-------------------	-----

LEGISLATION.....	284
------------------	-----

## Liberation of Brussels

### Statement by THE PRESIDENT

[Released to the press by the White House September 4]

Brussels, the capital of another freedom-loving people, has been delivered from four terrible years of tyranny—the second such period in a generation. The American people are filled with admiration for the imperturbable conduct of the Belgian people toward the hated invaders and their unswerving devotion to the ideals which they share with the people of the United States and the other United Nations.

### Statement by THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Released to the press September 4]

Twice in a generation Belgium and its capital have been forced to endure four long years of German military rule, a rule rendered less bearable this time by the subtler poison of the Nazi political police. But whatever the methods of the oppressor, the gallant Belgian people have never faltered in their devotion to the principles of freedom and democracy. The liberation of Brussels is not only a symbol of German defeat—it is a challenge to all peace-loving men to insure that never again shall the cities of the smaller nations resound to the tread of the aggressor's marching feet.

## The Greek Resistance Groups

### Statement by THE SECRETARY OF STATE

At his press and radio news conference on September 4 the Secretary of State made the following statement on the recent enlargement of the Greek Government to include representatives of EAM resistance groups from Greece:<sup>1</sup>

"As you know, this Government has followed the Greek situation with friendly interest and on previous occasions the President and I have ex-

pressed the earnest hope that the Greeks would be able to solve their political differences among themselves for the more effective prosecution of the struggle against our common enemy. It is therefore a source of satisfaction to the American Government and the American people to learn that the representatives of the resistance groups inside Greece have now joined the Government-in-exile. We are confident that this action will speed the now imminent liberation of the sorely tried Greek people and facilitate the rehabilitation of Greece and the Greek political life in accordance with the freely expressed desires of the Greek people."

<sup>1</sup>The term "EAM" is frequently used loosely to include not only EAM (National Liberation Front) but also other organizations within occupied Greece such as ELAS (National Army of Liberation), PEEA (Political Committee of National Liberation), and KKE (Communist Party of Greece).



## Suggested Curb on Cartels

### LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Released to the press by the White House September 8]

The President, under date of September 6, addressed the following letter to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY:

"During the past half century the United States has developed a tradition in opposition to private monopolies. The Sherman and Clayton Acts have become as much a part of the American way of life as the due process clause of the Constitution. By protecting the consumer against monopoly these statutes guarantee him the benefits of competition.

"This policy goes hand in glove with the liberal principles of international trade for which you have stood through many years of public service. The trade-agreement program has as its objective the elimination of barriers to the free flow of trade in international commerce; the anti-trust statutes aim at the elimination of monopolistic restraints of trade in interstate and foreign commerce.

"Unfortunately, a number of foreign countries, particularly in continental Europe, do not possess such a tradition against cartels. On the contrary, cartels have received encouragement from some of these governments. Especially is this true with respect to Germany. Moreover, cartels were utilized by the Nazis as governmental instrumentalities to achieve political ends. The history of the use of the I. G. Farben trust by the Nazis reads like a detective story. The defeat of the Nazi armies will have to be followed by the eradication of these weapons of economic warfare. But more than the elimination of the political activities of German cartels will be required. Cartel practices which restrict the free flow of goods in foreign commerce will have to be curbed. With international trade involved this end can be achieved only through collaborative action by the United Nations.

"I hope that you will keep your eye on this whole subject of international cartels because we are approaching the time when discussions will almost certainly arise between us and other nations.

"Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT"

## Political Advisers to General Eisenhower

### Statement by THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Released to the press September 5]

At his press and radio news conference on September 5 the Secretary of State was asked by a correspondent whether there was any comment he could make on published reports that Mr. Murphy and Mr. Reber were really State Department appointees rather than appointees of General Eisenhower. The correspondent said that, in other words, the implication had been given that General Eisenhower had had nothing to do with their appointments. The Secretary of State said in reply:

"It would seem that the names of Murphy and Reber are somewhat intriguing to those who would rather condemn than commend at any time. The State Department is pounced upon unmercifully by two or three editors because Robert Murphy received a recent appointment as Political Adviser to General Eisenhower for Germany alone and Samuel Reber as a Political Adviser to General Eisenhower in connection with the French civil situation.

"It is alleged that Mr. Reber was not appointed at the request of the military authorities, whereas the truth is that he was specifically suggested for this recent appointment by General Eisenhower's Chief of Staff. There is no more capable person in the Foreign Service than Samuel Reber. He is far above such small prejudices as are imputed to him.

"It is also alleged that the State Department alone was responsible for the recent appointment of Robert Murphy, whereas the truth is that his appointment met with the full approval of the President and the military authorities, as well as the Department of State.

"Again, Mr. Murphy is severely berated in the face of the fact that for the period in part for which he is criticized he received the Distinguished Service Medal for faithful and efficient service. Mr. Murphy, as a subordinate of General Eisenhower, supported him earnestly in connection with our experience with Darlan, which, according to reliable military authorities, saved the lives of some 16,000 Americans. Mr. Murphy was the leader in the movement that saved North Africa



from German occupation and kept Mediterranean bases out of German hands, thus paving the way for the American-North African expedition, and yet he is severely criticized by a few."

## A Common Policy For Peace and Security

### LETTERS EXCHANGED BETWEEN GOVERNOR DEWEY AND SECRETARY HULL

[Released to the press September 6]

*Governor Thomas E. Dewey to the Secretary of State*

"AUGUST 25, 1944.

"MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY:

"I am deeply gratified at the result of the discussions you have had with Mr. Dulles, my representative. They constitute a new attitude toward the problem of peace.

"Heretofore, war has been the only matter which has been lifted above partisanship during a presidential campaign. I recently said that if we are to have lasting peace, we must wage peace as we wage war.

"I feel that we are now making a beginning toward doing that and it is my hope that we shall have great success to that end.

"With assurances of my high esteem, I am,

"Sincerely yours,

"THOMAS E. DEWEY"

*The Secretary of State to Governor Thomas E. Dewey*

"SEPTEMBER 4, 1944.

"MY DEAR GOVERNOR DEWEY:

"You may be sure that I appreciate your letter of August 25 expressing gratification at the result of the conversations recently concluded here with Mr. Dulles.

"These conversations and your letter constitute a heartening manifestation of national unity on the problem of the establishment of an international peace and security organization. I am convinced that with unity, and only with unity, we can successfully carry forward this project which means so much to the people of this generation and to the people of generations to come.

"Sincerely yours,

"CORDELL HULL"

## United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration

### AMERICAN DELEGATION TO THE SECOND SESSION OF THE COUNCIL

[Released to the press September 6]

The President has approved the designation of the following persons to represent the Government of the United States of America at the Second Session of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which will convene in Montreal, Quebec, Canada, on September 15, 1944:

#### *Member of the Council*

Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State

#### *Alternate Member*

Rupert Emerson, Director, Liberated Areas Branch, Foreign Economic Administration (Committee on Supplies; Standing Technical Committee on Industrial Rehabilitation)

#### *Alternates on Committees of the Council*

Harold Glasser, Assistant Director, Division of Monetary Research, Treasury Department (Special Committee on Capacity to Pay for Supplies; Committee on Financial Control)

Abbot Low Moffat, Chief, Division of Southwest Pacific Affairs, and Adviser, Liberated Areas Division, Department of State (Committee for the Far East)

Herbert W. Parisius, Director, Office of Food Programs, Foreign Economic Administration (Standing Technical Committee on Agriculture)

Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service (Standing Technical Committee on Health)

E. F. Penrose, Special Assistant to the American Ambassador, London (Committee for Europe)

George L. Warren, Adviser on Refugees and Displaced Persons, Department of State (Standing Technical Committee on Displaced Persons)

Mrs. Ellen S. Woodward, Member, Social Security Board (Standing Technical Committee on Welfare)

#### *Adviser and Secretary General*

Warren Kelchner, Chief, Division of International Conferences, Department of State

James H. Wright, Assistant to Director, Office of American Republics Affairs, Department of State

#### *Press Relations Officer*

Lincoln White, Department of State

#### *Secretaries of the Delegation*

Clarke L. Willard, Assistant Chief, Division of International Conferences, Department of State

Frederick E. Farnsworth, Foreign Service Officer, Consulate General of the United States at Montreal

## A Historic Promise of Tolerance

Address by ASSISTANT SECRETARY BERLE<sup>1</sup>

[Released to the press September 10]

This conference includes Americans of all races, all creeds, and all colors. Its object is to renew a great American pledge. That pledge is our historic promise of tolerance.

With it goes a pledge of something greater and more splendid tolerance: the pledge of friendship between men of different faiths and of different race.

By fulfilling this pledge we earn the right to call ourselves Americans.

We do this in the year of our Lord 1944; but the best of America has been doing it for more than 300 years. Most of us came to America, or are descended from men and women who came to America, because of prejudice or intolerance or race hatred or religious discrimination in other parts of the world. This has gone on throughout all American history. Refugees who were called Pilgrims came to Massachusetts so that they could worship in their own way, free from discrimination in Europe. Catholics, for the same reason, settled in Maryland, and Quakers in Pennsylvania. Decade after decade saw new and ever-greater groups arriving. In our own lifetime the great Jewish immigration which followed the anti-Semitic pogroms at Kishinev is an outstanding example.

Americans are proud to remember that these groups not only have achieved tolerance of each other's beliefs, but that they also have formed bonds of friendship which hold together the great and living organism that is the United States.

This is a great achievement in statecraft and in morals. The finest tributes to it have been the attacks made on that structure by our enemies. An America united in friendship and mutual respect is invincible. Knowing this, the Nazi high command planned and tried to carry out a campaign to break up this great union: to split faith from faith; to set race against race; to Balkanize this country.

Their plan was crafty, and, like all Nazi plans, was aimed to capitalize on whatever evil instinct could be roused. Every document we have makes it clear that the spearhead of the attack was to be the creation of an anti-Semitic movement: to rouse hatred against Jews and, having done that, to create whatever other race hatreds they could stir up. Agents were trained in many methods of doing this; and they were placed in various parts of the world, including the United States, for that purpose. Some of them at least are now in jail, where they belong.

There is reason to believe that although the rousing of anti-Jewish prejudice was tops on the Nazi list of secret weapons, they planned other campaigns when time and opportunity permitted. America united was unconquerable; but if America could be divided into a huge series of minority groups each inflamed against the other, then the United States might be weakened or even rendered powerless. They little understood the spirit that is this country. They assumed that because certain great groups have Jewish names and are proud of them, and others Irish names and are proud of them, and others Italian names and are proud of them, and others Polish names and are proud of them, and that these and other groups remember their ancient culture—from this they believed that minorities could be created within our country as they have been created in various parts of Europe. They failed completely, save for a scattering handful of unbalanced people who count for nothing in our national life. How completely they failed is proved by the fact that a very great group of men of German ancestry with practical unanimity rejected this hateful doctrine. There is a man of that group who is proving it to them mile by mile and hour by hour; and his name is General Eisenhower.

We do not have, and God willing we will not have, minorities in the United States. We know only Americans; and they are just as good as any other Americans, whatever their religion or their race. This is accomplished not merely by Government policy, great as that policy is—the policy

<sup>1</sup> Delivered at the Inter-Faith Conference, New York City, Sept. 10, 1944.

of the Declaration of Independence and the guaranties of freedom and equality in the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights. It is accomplished by the day-to-day contacts and friendships which are the life of all of us. You cannot make tolerance and friendship by legislation or even by constitutions. You create it first in the minds and hearts of men and make it living and active in daily life.

That is why, properly, this subject is of concern to the churches of all faiths, such as those here represented. It is easy to talk about sweeping measures in Government and in international policy—measures intended to control somebody else. It is not always so easy for each of us to make rules for ourselves. Our churches can help us to do that; indeed it is due to the influence of our churches in an earlier century that we have this splendid structure of friendship and tolerance which has protected and saved our country in two successive World Wars.

If we had any doubt as to the soundness of American instinct on this point, we have only to look at the other side of the water. The Nazi structure was built on hatred; and progressively it carried that hatred to lengths so hideous that we now have the picture of an apparently insane people destroying themselves. You have read recently the reports of the German murder plants near Lublin in Poland; and you may have wondered whether such things could possibly be true. I am sorry to say that they are true—and more besides. For the information at hand seems to indicate that the hideous death plant at Lublin was merely one of several, operated by human butchers to accomplish the slaughter of millions of defenseless men, women, and children. Though they were primarily intended as instruments of anti-Jewish hatred, it would appear that other races likewise contributed victims to this nightmare in real life. And we also see the madness which created this horror steadily bringing retribution toward the fiends who conceived and executed it. At long last, and in terrible convulsion, the practice of hate destroys the hater. You are seeing the grim drama of terrible justice unrolling itself day by day. It is an awful lesson which no one can, and no one will, forget.

Happily, the sound human instincts do prevail. I have had the rare privilege of talking to airmen

who have had to bail out from broken planes and who have landed in almost all parts of the world. One who had landed in China not far from the Japanese lines was picked up, wounded, by a Chinese family and taken 800 miles to Chungking at the expense of the Chinese doctor who tended his wounds. Another fell in the mountain region of central Italy and was cared for by Italian peasants as tenderly as though he had been one of their own boys. Others have landed in different parts of Yugoslavia—controlled by Mikhailovitch and controlled by Tito. Still others came down in German-occupied France. In no case did anyone ask whether the boy in khaki was a Jew or a Gentile, a Catholic or a Protestant, a Nordic or a non-Aryan. In some cases, indeed, the boys came from racial stocks historically the enemies of the population where the parachute let them down. But in the vast majority of cases there was an immediate demonstration of friendship and kindness, even when showing kindness endangered the lives of the people who took care of our boys. We have had this happen all the way from the Solomon Islands to eastern Europe. We have had this same friendship from little people of every race and language and class. These rescued boys know that decent humanity knows no prejudices and that all men are created equal.

I am glad to pay this tribute to many people whose names we shall never know. Sometimes we can express our appreciation: we did find the Chinese doctor who rescued General Doolittle's flyer and arranged for him to complete his medical study in America on a Government scholarship. We have tried to find others where we could. But this is secondary to the main fact: we know that friendship brings friendship in return; and that those who love their neighbors find those same neighbors a mighty fortress of help in time of trouble.

This is good statesmanship. It is good government. It is good religion, Protestant or Catholic or Jewish. It is good Americanism.

On this great principle of common equality, conceived in toleration and friendship and denying race and religious prejudice and hatred, this country has been founded and has grown strong. Each of us is the keeper and protector of this common faith.



## Twenty-Sixth International Labor Conference

### REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN DELEGATION<sup>1</sup>

[Released to the press September 5]

The following report on the Philadelphia Conference of the International Labor Organization has been received by the Secretary of State from the Secretary of Labor, who was the Chairman of the American Delegation to the Conference.

#### COMPOSITION OF THE CONFERENCE

The Twenty-Sixth Conference of the International Labor Organization was held in Philadelphia from April 20 to May 12, 1944. Forty-four states in all took part, three as observers.<sup>2</sup> Twenty-eight nations sent fully tripartite delegations. Costa Rica was readmitted to membership.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State, as officials of the host country, sent greetings to the Conference during its opening days. After the close of the Conference, delegates were invited to Mr. Roosevelt's study, where he congratulated them on the work they had done and, on behalf of the United States, endorsed the specific terms of the "Declaration of Philadelphia".

#### AGENDA ITEMS RELATING TO THE AIMS AND POLICIES OF THE I.L.O., AND OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The first two items of the agenda of the Conference were:<sup>3</sup>

- I. Future policy, program, and status of the International Labor Organization
- II. Recommendations to the United Nations for present and post-war social policy

The cautious language employed to designate these items of the agenda gives only a hint of their scope. How shall the activities of the I.L.O. be related to those of other international organizations now in existence or still to be created? Shall its work be expanded or contracted? Is the Constitution of the Organization an adequate instru-

ment for the great tasks of the future? What changes are to be considered? The second item addresses itself to the war against poverty. It seeks to make concrete the concept of absence of poverty.

After discussion in plenary session the Conference deemed this set of items to be closely interrelated, and its action was to adopt a series of resolutions and a declaration, which form a unified pattern. The elements of this pattern are:

1. The mitigation of poverty and unemployment is recognized as an important goal of the United Nations.
2. Wherever low levels of living exist locally they must be regarded as endangering prosperity and security everywhere.
3. The I.L.O., as the international instrument most concerned with the mitigation of unemployment and poverty, must be strengthened.
4. Human beings are not the creatures of fate; by taking thought and by making deliberate, humane, and moral choices of action they may themselves abolish poverty and fear of want.

The declaration and the most important resolutions adopted that make up this pattern are designated as follows in the record of the Conference:

1. Declaration concerning the aims and purposes of the I.L.O. (also known as the "Declaration of Philadelphia" and the "Philadelphia Charter")<sup>4</sup>
2. Resolution concerning social provisions in the peace settlement<sup>5</sup>
3. Resolution concerning economic policies for the attainment of social objectives<sup>6</sup>
4. Resolution concerning constitutional practice
5. Resolution concerning social insurance in the peace settlement

The first of these, the so-called "Declaration of Philadelphia," restates the fundamental objectives of the I.L.O., reaffirms the basic principles of its Constitution, holds that the raising of labor standards should not be regarded as a negative process of correcting abuses but the positive one of abolishing poverty, and declares that the cen-

<sup>1</sup> Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor.

<sup>2</sup> See also *post*, p. 262.

<sup>3</sup> BULLETIN of Apr. 8, 1944, p. 316.

<sup>4</sup> BULLETIN of May 20, 1944, p. 482.

<sup>5</sup> BULLETIN of June 3, 1944, p. 514.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 517.

tral aim of all governmental policies is the attainment of conditions under which all men everywhere may pursue "their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security, and equal opportunity." The remaining clauses of the Declaration define the specific responsibilities of the I.L.O. in contributing toward the achievement of the goals defined in the early clauses.

The Declaration of Philadelphia was adopted by acclamation, and the text differs little from that originally put forward by the International Labor Office. The other texts adopted under items I and II were, however, objects of much discussion. A question raised by an Australian governmental delegate was whether nations, in addition to recognizing their duties to maintain employment, should not also contract with each other to initiate and carry into execution domestic policies that will induce full employment. In support of this position that nations should contract with each other to maintain high levels of employment, it was argued that full employment in the United States and the United Kingdom was essential to the welfare of countries having, like Australia, "dependent economies."

Some workers' delegates objected to the Australian proposal because it implied governmental action solely in the realm of social and economic policy and a repudiation of the tripartite principle. The following paragraph in one of the resolutions was finally adopted:

"The Conference recommends to Governments that a Conference of representatives of the Governments of the United, Associated, and other Nations, willing to attend, be called at an early date, in association with the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, to consider an international agreement on domestic policies of employment and unemployment; and this Conference pledges the full cooperation and the assistance of the I.L.O. in calling such a conference on employment, and in helping to carry into effect appropriate decisions it might make."

Resolutions 2 and 5 designated above relate to the social provisions of the peace settlement. The former states that high levels of employment and the raising of standards of living are matters of international concern. It proposes that the peace settlement should be taken as an opportunity to

secure international agreement on certain minimum labor standards. Resolution 5, also related to the social terms of the peace settlement, seeks to protect those who have been brought into "Hitler's slave market". It proposes a method whereby social-insurance rights that would have been acquired by Axis nationals shall become the rights of those displaced persons who have been recruited to work for the Axis from occupied areas. Two committees, both to be selected by the Governing Body, are to carry out the policies embodied in the resolutions above. On the social-insurance committee, places are reserved for all states primarily affected.

The third resolution, on economic policies to attain social objectives, has a section on national policies and another on international policies. The national policies endorsed by the Conference recommend, among others, an orderly industrial demobilization, avoidance of inflationary or deflationary policies, discouragement of monopoly. On the international plane, UNRRA is endorsed, and the creation of other special technical international instruments is urged (e.g., food, monetary). The international movement of capital should be promoted; world trade should expand on a multilateral basis; orderly migration should be established.

To strengthen the I.L.O. and to permit it to develop the program entrusted to it, the I.L.O. adopted the fourth resolution identified above. By the terms of this resolution, the Organization will develop its specialized activities industry by industry and region by region. Of greater importance are the provisions relating to the I.L.O.'s relations with other international organizations, now in existence or to be created. The resolution instructs the Director and Governing Body to carry out certain functions that cannot now be performed by the League of Nations (official communication of documents to members and vice versa). The Governing Body is directed to appoint a committee with the power to consider the relationship of the Organization to other international bodies, desirable constitutional changes, and methods of financing the Organization. Immediately after the Conference the Governing Body selected this committee and, to permit the Organization to enlarge its activities, doubled the budget of the Office.

This last question, finance, merits further discussion. An important bond between the I.L.O.

and the League is the financial one, the League still being *de jure* the collector of contributions and the final budgetary arbiter. No action was taken at the Conference to alter this situation, though it may be noted that chapter 6 of the secretariat's report on the first item of the agenda intimates that the I.L.O. should adopt its own budget and collect its own contributions. An American employer and a French governmental delegate advocated the loosening of League ties in the Conference debates. Any proposal tantamount to revision of the I.L.O. Constitution is now impracticable both because of the cumbersomeness of the normal amendment procedure and still more because of the impossibility of intelligent revision until the future status of a new "general international organization" is determined.

Other adopted resolutions relating to items I and II were:

Resolution concerning the action of federal states on conventions and recommendations

Resolution concerning the international character of the responsibilities of the Director and staff

Resolution concerning a regional conference of the countries of the Near and Middle East

Resolution concerning industrial committees

Resolution concerning the protection of transferred foreign workers, their organizations, and employers' organizations

Resolution concerning the problems involved in labor provisions for internationally financed development works

The action of a subcommittee devoted to a sub-item under item II deserves mention. The subcommittee was asked to make its recommendation on "Government and Administration of Germany and Other Totalitarian Countries in Europe by the United Nations". A British governmental delegate opened the debate by saying that the absence of the Soviet Union made inopportune the discussion of this matter. Others shared this view. A French governmental delegate suggested that this question be referred to the Governing Body, which, at a more appropriate time, might express its opinion. A representative of the United States Government supported this view, which was adopted by the Conference.

#### ITEMS RELATING TO TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

The three remaining items on the agenda were:

III. The organization of employment in the transition from war to peace

IV. Social security; principles, and problems arising out of the war

V. Minimum standards of social policy in dependent territories

These three items may be grouped together because they were a continuation of the technical, pre-war work of the I.L.O. They differed from the two items discussed above in that action on them involved no novel questions of policy. They may be disposed of by listing the recommendations and resolutions adopted under each heading, though it should be noted that this year, for the first time, the United States took an important part in discussions related to dependent territories.

#### *Organization of employment*

Recommendation on employment in the transition from war to peace

Recommendation on the organization of the employment services

Recommendation on the planning of public works

Resolution concerning the application of previous decisions of the conference regarding the organization of employment

Resolution concerning the exchange of information on the subject of public works

#### *Social security*

Recommendation on income security

Recommendation on social security for the armed forces

Recommendation on medical care

Resolution concerning a conference on social security in Asiatic countries

Resolution concerning international administration to promote social security

#### *Dependent territories*

Recommendation on social policy in dependent territories

Resolution placing the question of social policy in dependent territories on the agenda of the next conference

Resolution concerning the setting up of an advisory committee on standards of social policy in dependent territories



# DECLARATION BY DELEGATIONS OF OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

A French governmental delegate stated before a plenary session of the Conference that for occupied and devastated countries the question of mere transition from a war economy to a peace economy is of less importance than the question of economic and social reconstruction. With other delegates from occupied countries, he placed before the Conference a declaration asserting that, during the period of reconstruction, occupied countries "are justified in counting upon the full collaboration of countries less impoverished than they". Their representatives are convinced "that the countries that have known neither occupation nor devastation will wish to give them priority in the supply of the essential consumption and capital goods required for their economic and social restoration".

In response to this declaration, Miss Perkins (delegate of the United States) introduced a resolution expressing the hope that the United Nations and other members of the Conference would promote in every way the social and economic recovery of devastated and occupied countries. This was unanimously adopted.

## ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

Nothing worthy of special note was done by the Selection Committee or the Committee on the Application of Conventions. In the Resolutions Committee, a resolution concerning action by federal states on conventions and recommendations was adopted providing that federal governments may transmit conventions and recommendations to constituent states for their separate action.

The work of the Credentials Committee is summarized in the table below. Its final report, accepted by the Conference, questioned no credentials, since all objections raised in the Committee had either been met by reasonable explanations or had been withdrawn.

### OBJECTIONS WERE RAISED

Concerning:	By:
1. Indian workers' delegate and advisers (members of Indian Federation of Labor)	All India Trade Union Congress

Rival labor groups; Indian Government intends to recognize each group in alternating years; Conference accepts this explanation

Concerning:	By:
2. Yugoslav workers' delegate and advisers	Yugoslav Seamen's Union (London representative)

London representative of Yugoslav Seamen's Union does not recognize Royal Yugoslav Government-in-exile; members of I.L.O. do, however; objection has no support

3. Yugoslav Government delegates	United South Slav Committee
----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Members of I.L.O. recognize Royal Yugoslav Government-in-exile; objection has no support

4. Argentine workers' delegate and advisers	Secretary, workers' group, I.L.O. Conference
---	--

Objection withdrawn by Secretary of workers' group

5. Greek workers' delegate and advisers	Panhellenic Federation of Maritime Trade Unions
---	---

Credentials Committee unanimously agrees that, under prevailing circumstances of German repression, Greek Government could not have made choice by any better method

## GOVERNING BODY ELECTION

This year the electoral colleges met. Their function is to select occupants for non-permanent governmental seats on the Governing Body of the Office and to name appropriate representatives of workers and employers. Changes were made, though the new Governing Body retains most of its former members. Peru and Greece were selected to fill vacancies created by the now-effective withdrawal of Spain and by a previous decision to include China as a permanent rather than non-permanent member. Several new regular members were selected to replace former worker and employer members who cannot now be reached in occupied Europe. The following list of members and delegates gives full details.

The election of the electoral college is valid for approximately a year or until the next general conference permits of an election. Thus, if applications for membership in the I.L.O. are received from non-member governments, consideration can be given to whatever wishes they may express concerning representation on the Governing Body.

# PARTICIPATION IN CONFERENCE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION 1944

## 1. States represented by full tripartite delegations:

*United States of America	*Ecuador
*Argentina	*Egypt
*Australia	*France
*Belgium	*Greece
*Bolivia	*India
*Brazil	*Mexico
*British Empire	*Netherlands
*Canada	*New Zealand
*Chile	*Norway
*China	*Panama
*Cuba	*Peru
*Czechoslovakia	*Poland
*Dominican Republic	Sweden
	*Union of South Africa
	*Yugoslavia

## 2. States represented by incomplete delegations:

### a. Employer absent

*Colombia	Costa Rica
-----------	------------

### b. Employer and worker absent

Haiti	Turkey
Iraq	*Venezuela
*Luxembourg	

### c. Local diplomatic representation only

Ethiopia	Liberia
*Iran	Switzerland
*Ireland	*Uruguay

## 3. Non-member states sending observers:

Iceland	Paraguay
Nicaragua	

## 4. Member states that attended neither the 1941 nor the 1944 conference:

Afghanistan	Finland
Albania	Hungary
Bulgaria	Latvia
**Denmark	Lithuania
Estonia	Portugal

\*Participated in both the 1941 and 1944 conferences. Thailand participated in 1941 but not in 1944.

\*\*In 1944 the Minister in the United States for the Danish people briefly addressed a plenary session of the Conference.

# COMPOSITION OF GOVERNING BODY

## 1. Government seats

### a. Permanent

United States of America	France
Belgium	Great Britain
Canada	India
China	Netherlands

### b. Temporary

Brazil	Norway
Chile	Peru
Greece	Poland
Mexico	Yugoslavia

## 2. Workers' seats

### Regular

Mr. Hallsworth (British Empire)	Mr. Crofts (Australia)
Mr. Watt (U. S. A.)	Mr. Oldenbroek (Netherlands)
Mr. Andersson (Sweden)	Mr. Kosina (Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Laurent (France)	Mr. Ibañez (Chile)
Mr. Rens (Belgium)	Mr. Downes (Union of South Africa)
Mr. Chu Hsueh-fan (China)	Mr. Adamczyk (Poland)
Mr. Lombardo Toledano (Mexico)	Mr. Mordahl (Norway)
Mr. Bengough (Canada)	Mr. Mehta (India)

### Deputy

## 3. Employers' seats

### Regular

Col. Antoine (France)	Mr. Li Ming (China)
Col. Chapa (Mexico)	Mr. Dahl (Norway)
Mr. Erulkar (India)	Mr. Macdonnell (Canada)
Sir John Forbes Watson (British Empire)	Mr. Cowley Herfinders (Cuba)
Mr. Gemmill (Union of South Africa)	Mr. Falter (Poland)
Mr. Harriman (U. S. A.)	Mr. Kulukundis (Greece)
Mr. Joassart (Belgium)	Mr. Warning (Netherlands)
Mr. Morawetz (Czechoslovakia)	Mr. Banats (Yugoslavia)

### Deputy

# THE FOREIGN SERVICE

## Consular Offices]

The American Consulate at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, was opened to the public on September 2, 1944.

On September 15, 1944, the American Vice Consulate at Adana, Turkey, will be raised to the rank of a Consulate.

## Fifth Anniversary of the German Attack on Poland

[Released to the press September 4]

The texts of messages between the President of the United States and the President of the Republic of Poland on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the German attack on Poland follow:

### *The President of the United States to the President of the Republic of Poland*

Five years ago on September first, Poland, the first nation to take up arms against our common enemy, rose to defend herself against a powerful and brutal aggressor. The indomitable people and soldiers of Poland, in spite of intolerable repression, have never slakened in that fight and today are still striking valiant and effective blows in the cause of liberty.

I wish to assure you, Mr. President, of the deep admiration and sympathy of the people of the United States for the heroic Polish people and to thank you for your telegram conveying expressions of faith and admiration for my country.

### *The President of the Republic of Poland to the President of the United States*

On the fifth anniversary of the outbreak of this World War provoked by Germany's treacherous assault on Poland on September 1, 1939, I desire to convey to you, Mr. President, a message of friendship to the American nation and the expression of our admiration for its gigantic achievements and for the heroic part which American soldiers, sailors and airmen are so decisively playing in forging the coming victory.

Polish forces have been fighting for five years on land, on the seas and in the air and today in the streets of the martyred city of Warsaw. The Polish people are once more fighting openly sustained by the unshakable faith that the high ideals in defense of which the United Nations took up the challenge will find their full realization in a peace of freedom and justice and the respect of the inalienable rights of nations.

## International Peace And Security Organization

### MEETINGS

[Released to the press by the State Department on the Washington Conversations September 4]

The Steering Committee met on the morning of September 4. The Subcommittee on Security Organization met in the afternoon.

## Declaration Concerning Czechoslovak Army

[Released to the press September 7]

The Czechoslovak Government in London on September 2, 1944 proclaimed all military forces fighting against the Germans in Czechoslovakia to be members of the regular Czechoslovak Army.

With reference to the operations of Czechoslovak forces in Europe, including the forces which have begun combat in Slovakia, the Government of the United States reiterates its view that all members of the armed forces of the countries at war with Germany which are engaged in active combat should be treated by the German military authorities in accordance with the laws and customs of war.

The United States Government therefore declares:

(1) The soldiers of the Czechoslovak Army, including those in Slovakia and other parts of Czechoslovakia, constitute a combat force operating against the Germans.

(2) The soldiers of the Czechoslovak Army are instructed to conduct their military operations in accordance with the rules of war and in so doing they bear arms openly against the enemy and are provided with Czechoslovak uniforms or a distinctive emblem.

(3) In these circumstances reprisals by the German military authorities against the soldiers of the Czechoslovak Army violate the rules of war by which Germany is bound. The United States Government, therefore, solemnly warns all Germans who take part in or are in any way responsible for such violations that they do so at their peril and will be held answerable for their crimes.



# Food as a Facet in International Trade

By LEROY D. STINEBOWER<sup>1</sup>

[Released to the press September 7]

## I

Foodstuffs have more than once occupied a prominent place in discussion at critical turning points in the history of the commercial policies of nations. The repeal of the Corn Laws in England, Bismarck's famous "compact of iron and rye," and the Austro-Serbian "pig war," which played an important role in leading to real war in the Balkans, are only a few of the more striking instances out of many that could be cited. In this country the first step in the return to high protectionism following the last war was the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921, which dealt principally with agricultural products, and the tariff revision which became the Tariff Act of 1930 was initiated on behalf of, and was originally supposed to be confined to, the relief of agriculture.

But while *foodstuffs* and their producers have often been very much at the core of international trade policies, until recently there has been little public discussion of the relation of international trade to *food* and the people who have to eat it to live.

## II

At the outset it will be useful to have in mind some rough quantitative characteristics of the place of foodstuffs in international trade. In the pre-war decade, 1929-1938, foodstuffs accounted for roughly one fourth of the value of all commodities moving in international trade, but with a tendency for the proportion to stand somewhat lower at the close of the period than at the beginning. The year-to-year fluctuations in this proportion were considerably greater than in the case of manufactured articles and somewhat less than for raw materials.

The international movement of commodities in this decade was, of course, greatly affected by the

fluctuations in the level of economic activity throughout the world and by a marked growth in the number, variety, and severity of restrictions on international trade and international payments. In addition the wide fluctuations in prices and in foreign-exchange rates make necessary a certain reserve with respect to summary generalizations about changes in value and volume of trade over the period. But with these reservations it is approximately true that by 1938 the value of all world trade in terms of current dollars had recovered from its depression low points to about two thirds its 1929 level, and its quantum (an approximation of volume) to a little less than 90 percent. Foodstuffs, like raw materials, had experienced much wider price fluctuations than had manufactured products. The quantum of foodstuffs was relatively more stable from year to year than that of the other major categories of commodities but even so fell by 18 percent and only recovered half of the loss and at the end of the period was still about one twelfth below the 1929 volume.

There was during the thirties a substantial shift in the composition of international trade, with raw materials gaining in relative volume as compared to foodstuffs and with foodstuffs declining relatively in value in comparison with both raw materials and manufactured articles.

It will be useful to bear in mind also that international trade in foodstuffs is a comparatively concentrated trade. Roughly two thirds of the total in 1938 was made up of three meats (beef, mutton, and pork), three cereals and flour (wheat, corn, and rice), butter, sugar, citrus fruits, vegetable fatty oils and oilseeds, coffee, tea, and tobacco. The mere enumeration of these commodities also serves to indicate the high degree of concentration of the exports of many of them in a few countries or areas.

But while the major foodstuff exports are highly concentrated in a few countries, production is not. Agriculture is not only the world's leading industry, it is also the one most widely distributed. Each country can and does produce a large part of its

<sup>1</sup> Paper presented before the Twentieth Institute of the Norman Wait Harris Foundation, University of Chicago, Sept. 7, 1944. Mr. Stinebower is an Adviser in the Office of Economic Affairs, Department of State.

own food supply and, except for some of the distinctive foodstuffs of the tropics, each country produces some part, usually substantial, of nearly every kind of food consumed. This would continue to be true in the absence of any trade restrictions. For most countries there tends naturally and without interference to be more self-sufficiency in food than in other broad categories of commodities. In part this flows from the fact that agriculture is an industry subject to conditions of increasing cost, in part because transportation costs over long distances would be prohibitive in relation to value, and in part because of the perishable nature of some of the foods. In part it is also because food production is often a by-product of other activities. For example, a dairy farm, a cotton plantation, or a coffee ranch usually produces a large part of its own food even though it may produce none for sale. Finally, food habits are more flexible and adaptable to locally available supplies than is true of most other items of consumption. In the United States the North eats white potatoes, the South, sweet potatoes; northern China eats millet and wheat, southern China, rice; Norwegians eat more fish than do Swedes; and Normandy drinks cider and apple brandy, while the rest of France drinks wine. The pattern of consumption in fuel, clothing, or even of gadgets is far less variable in terms of local resources.

There is an important corollary of this. Because the factors of food production are so widely distributed and can be combined in such a variety of proportions, each country can, at a cost, greatly increase the production of almost all important foods or of substitutes therefor. Under such circumstances the gains from international trade do not always seem apparent. It is self-evident to anyone that if there are no tin or copper deposits within a country, the only way to acquire these materials is by trade. Until a country has a steel industry, it can have railroads only by buying rails. It is even simple to understand that Honduras cannot support an automobile industry or that grapes cannot be commercially produced in Scotland. But in meat and wheat, sugar and butter, a stimulated increase in production will appear to be an addition to the national income, whether actually so or not, rather than a cost. The cost becomes apparent in daily experience, if at all, only when the process is

driven to extremes where the domestic price of the commodity begins to be several times what it could be imported for, or when the country's own export markets begin to dry up as a result of its restricted imports. Furthermore, once production has been increased by protection or by other price-supporting devices, it begins to be assumed that the entire output is dependent on such support for remunerative prices and that the alternative to these policies is not merely less production but no production at all.

There are no satisfactory figures on which to base any estimates, but as a rough guess the six billion dollars of foodstuffs and related products which entered international trade in 1938 would not appear to have exceeded, at most, 5 or 6 percent of the total volume of foods and feeds consumed in that year and may well have been much less. Even under much freer trade and with the most optimistic estimate of expanding and improved food consumption and levels of income in general, it would not appear likely that as much as 10 percent of the world's food would become an object of international trade. The smallness of this percentage is not, however, a measure of the significance of such trade. For small as it is, it is in large part a determinant of the standard of food consumption in many countries of the world. Within the framework of commercial policies affecting it, it determines whether the consumers of a given country must obtain their food from domestic sources, no matter how high the costs of production may be, or whether they may benefit by the lower-cost production of other countries. In the case of the bread grains, policies which drive the price to as much as three times world levels may not greatly reduce the consumption of bread; they may even increase it because it is still the cheapest food. But they do cause the consumer's food budget, which is inadequate in most of the world in any case, to be increasingly exhausted on these staples, leaving an even narrower margin or no margin at all for the more expensive protective foods. When the restrictive or other price-enhancing policies are applied to such items as butter, fruits, and meats, for which the demand is more elastic, the effect is a direct reduction in the consumption of these foods and a deterioration of the quality of diets as well as a reduction in international trade.

But the effects do not stop there, for these reductions in food imports induce an inability or unwillingness of the food-exporting countries to maintain their imports. The results are declining incomes for the consumers in both sets of countries and reduced levels of production and consumption in both.

Although stated abstractly, this is not based solely on theoretical analysis. It is in essence what happened to international trade in the inter-war period.

### III

The first World War greatly disrupted and reduced European agriculture and even more greatly stimulated food production outside Europe, especially in North America, Argentina, and Australia. European agricultural recovery was not immediate, deficits in food supply continued, and the severe restrictions on trade which characterized the early post-war years were applied in general more against manufactured goods than against foodstuffs. Some export restrictions were even maintained on foodstuffs and raw materials. As a consequence world trade in the principal foodstuffs remained higher than it had been in 1914. By 1925, however, European wheat production and the animal population were roughly back to the pre-war level. In the same year, Italy instituted its "battle of grain" with the objective of freeing the country as far as possible from imports of foodstuffs, and Germany celebrated the recovery of its right, under the peace treaties, to impose customs duties by promptly applying high tariffs on food items. French duties on food products were increased in 1926 and 1927. From then on the rise in agricultural duties throughout most of Europe was steady, whereas duties on manufactures were on the whole being stabilized or even slightly reduced. England, Belgium, and the Netherlands alone remained significant exceptions to the trend. In the United States the first post-war tariff action was to raise duties on a considerable number of agricultural products in the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921. These rates were further increased in 1922 and 1930, and between these years the "flexible" tariff provision was used almost exclusively to increase duties on agricultural products. For the most part the American increases remained more or less ineffective since, with a few important exceptions, this country was on an export basis in the major protected items.

Beginning in about 1925, therefore, the balance which had existed between European and non-European agriculture was impaired and prices of foods in international markets began to decline. The decline was countered by higher duties still further aggravating the position of the exporters. As the depression developed and world prices continued to fall, nearly every country attempted to protect its own agriculture from the impact and even to expand its own production. European tariff rates continued to rise, even to three or four hundred percent of world prices and were supplemented by even more effective devices such as quotas, import licenses, mixing requirements, absolute prohibitions of imports, state monopolies, exchange controls, and exchange depreciation. Discrimination and trade diversion were superimposed on this restrictive picture through imperial and other preferences, differential tariff rates, multiple exchange rates, and clearing and payments agreements. Germany took advantage of the opportunity offered by agricultural depression to draw the countries of eastern and southern Europe into its economic orbit by paying high prices in their own currencies for their agricultural products, thus divorcing them from the world price level and rendering them almost wholly dependent on Germany as a market.

The food and raw-material exporting countries in turn increased restrictions on their imports, blocked payments for the goods they did import, depreciated their currencies, competitively subsidized their exports, adopted price or income supporting devices for their producers (in some cases with, in others without, restrictions on production), and entered into preferential or barter arrangements for limited outlets for their crops.

It would be wholly erroneous to infer that all these developments arose solely out of agricultural restrictions or that they were confined to agricultural products, or that the depression was predominantly an agricultural phenomenon. But so significant were they in the field of agriculture and so extensively were their effects felt in industrial and agricultural countries alike that by 1932 the Senate had called on the Department of Agriculture in this country and in 1934 the League of Nations had called on its Economic Committee for reports on the world situation in agricultural protectionism.

What recovery in trade did occur in the five years following 1933 was more in response to



general economic recovery than to any general relaxation of restrictions, in fact in many countries the restrictions increased. The sole major effort to reverse the trend was that embodied in the trade agreements concluded by this country. A large majority of the agreements of other countries, even when they did open up trade channels to some extent, were bilateral and discriminatory in character and, if in some instances they did stimulate trade along lines of greatest economic advantage, this result was largely fortuitous.

The principal conclusion that stands out in retrospect from this experience is that the measures taken with respect to agriculture and international trade in food products, Draconian as they were, did not even remotely achieve the results they sought. They did not bring agricultural prosperity and stability to the importing countries. Even less did they bring economic balance and stability in their economies as a whole. And some doubt may be felt today by the peoples of Europe themselves, as to whether the achievement of a considerable measure of food self-sufficiency for strategic reasons was worth the cost.

On the other hand, subsidies, two-price systems, import and production restrictions, and special measures to move surpluses through non-commercial channels, did not bring equilibrium in the trade relations of the exporting countries, nor did they prevent the growing accumulation of stocks in those countries. In varying degrees in different countries, these measures did, however, achieve one of their objectives; they did improve the money incomes of farmers as a group.

What these measures did produce was an intensification of maladjustment in the world pattern of agricultural production, depressed world prices for food staples which were not allowed to be passed on to consumers, the discouragement of consumption, and an intensification of governmental intervention in the processes of production and trade. The shifting of production away from efficient producers toward high-cost producers was twofold. First, in the importing countries the extremes to which governments had to go in order to sustain increased agricultural production furnish measures of the higher costs and competitive disadvantage of the producers whom they were trying to protect. Furthermore, what imports were permitted were more and more brought within the framework of preferential arrangements, clearing agreements, and other trade-di-

verting devices, the general effect of which was to shift production away from the more efficient foreign sources of supply to other foreign sources which could not have competed except with the aid of these special arrangements. Second, in the "surplus" countries there was little tendency for production to concentrate in the hands of the lower-cost producers. Both political and social considerations dictated that governmental measures to support incomes of producers should be applied with a more or less impartial hand, supporting high-cost and low-cost producers alike, and for the most part, when production was reduced, it was through a proportional reduction of the output of all.

The repercussions on consumption were also twofold. Protective measures, on the one hand, resulted in substantially increased prices which, as might be expected, were accompanied by a marked deterioration in the quality of consumption. The other effect on consumption was a result of the general diminution of purchasing power arising out of conditions of depression and restricted foreign markets. In addition, the burden of the higher prices was necessarily borne to a disproportionate extent by the lower-income groups, whose consumption was already inadequate.

Another effect of these measures was the development of the concept that there was a "surplus" of the major foodstuffs, at just the time that there was developing an increasing awareness of the nutritional inadequacies of a large part of the world's population, even in the countries of relatively high average incomes. The concept of agricultural surpluses is an ambiguous one. In the physical sense of extraordinarily large stocks, such surpluses did not come into being until there was governmental intervention to support prices above the world level in the principal exporting countries. Despite the mass of restrictions that were developing, the world did currently absorb substantially all that was produced. But the contracting markets in which these foods could be disposed of and the low elasticities of demand for them meant that they found outlets only at disastrously low prices, and in this sense the concept of surplus production arose even before physical stocks began accumulating and was of course the principal reason for those forms of intervention which resulted in the accumulation of stocks.

In the United States we have since 1934, by one device or another, maintained the incomes of pro-

ducers of our major food products, including those with respect of which we are on an export basis, at levels substantially above those which world prices would have yielded, and, except for the period when this was accomplished by means of the processing tax, we have done it by devices which maintain domestic prices, as well as producers' returns, well above world price levels. In spite of some success through trade agreements in regaining foreign markets for these products, and, in spite of substantial reductions in acreage devoted to some of them (but not necessarily in the amount produced), the higher American price has meant either that stocks have continued to accumulate or that they have been sold abroad at lower prices than they bring in this country.

#### IV

Now we are in another war and again European agriculture is gravely disrupted and non-European agriculture has been greatly expanded. We may feel with a certain weariness that this is where we came in and that we have seen the show. Unfortunately, however, we cannot now walk out. What we can attempt to do is to learn something from the inter-war period and endeavor not to see the same show again.

As compared with conditions at the end of the last war, the prospective situation at the close of this war promises to contain problems of even greater dimensions.

*First.* There will be the same general situation with respect to production: food deficits which may in a few years turn into "surpluses."

*Second.* There will be a greater need than before for Europe to maintain for at least one crop year the maximum possible output of energy foods which in the longer run it would be uneconomic for Europe to produce on so large a scale, with the resulting risk of perpetuation of such a production pattern. Both the Food Conference at Hot Springs and the Council of UNRRA at Atlantic City have recognized that freedom from hunger must take priority over more desirable nutritional and agricultural goals, and that, so long as a general shortage of food persists, every effort should be made to increase the production of foods for direct human consumption "even if this involves a departure from the use of the resources which in the long run will be required, and even if it delays a return to production pol-

icies which are desirable for technical, economic, or nutritional reasons."

*Third.* In the interest of the greatest possible mobilization of resources for the prosecution of the war, there has been a greater degree of government intervention in the processes of trade, especially international trade, in this war than in the last, with the prospect that general or localized scarcities may make the retention of at least some of these controls necessary and desirable for a time. Shortages of supply and shortages of shipping have led to the almost complete displacement of private trade and have substituted centralized control for the more ordinary processes of the market place. Practically all international purchases are now conducted on a bulk basis by official public agencies, and a large part of these purchases are made under intergovernmental contracts governing the entire output of supplying countries. Through the Combined Food Board, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada virtually determine how the output not only of their own countries but of all other areas whose supplies are available to the United Nations shall be allocated between the armed forces and civilians and how civilian supplies shall be allocated among the consuming countries. Furthermore, the same agency allocates a large part of the areas of supply, as fields for exclusive purchasing activity by either the United States or the United Kingdom, and frequently helps decide the prices at which purchases shall be made. The procurement activities themselves are not carried on by the Board but by agencies of one or the other Governments.

These wartime economic controls, including direct participation on the part of government agencies in international trade, have been adopted solely as means of furthering the prosecution of the war and not as instruments of commercial policy. If they are not to become powerful instruments of commercial policy, it will be essential, however, that they be terminated as quickly as is compatible with the war effort or with the need for assuring equitable distribution of scarce supplies. There are already disturbing signs, however, that unless there can be some assurance of reasonably adequate supplies for deficit countries and reasonable assurance of opportunity to market available supplies abroad, these wartime state-trading arrangements may be continued into the



post-war period for other than purely emergency reasons. For example, the British Minister of Food on August 3 of this year announced in the House of Commons the conclusion of an agreement between the New Zealand and British Governments for the sale to the United Kingdom of the total exportable surplus of New Zealand of butter, cheese, beef, veal, mutton, and lamb for the next four years and of pork until June 1946. The prices at which these sales will be made are fixed for the first two years but are subject to review in the third and fourth years.

*Finally*, as compared with 1918, we have in practically every country a background of higher pre-war protection for domestic agriculture as well as a background of national price and income supporting programs, generally involving subsidies and two-price systems. In addition the food producing countries have not only used price stimuli in their own countries to bring out a greater production of food, but the economies of other countries have been geared to the prices and contracts which the United States and the United Kingdom have made with them to stimulate and to assure their production. Even if the contracts are terminable at the end of the war or period of shortage, we cannot be indifferent to the effects of a sudden economic slump in those areas.

## V

International trade in food obviously does not exist as something apart from the rest of the economy. The problems of readjustment and reconstruction in this field are, therefore, only one way of looking at the problems of international trade and of agricultural and industrial readjustment in general.

It is not difficult to define what the major problems are. They include the need for relaxation of special wartime controls of production and trade as rapidly as is consistent with an orderly transition period. They include the need for measures to maintain employment and income at high levels and to mitigate extreme economic fluctuations. And they include the need to insure that as production is readjusted, it will be along lines that correspond with the natural and economic advantages of each country or area. In some few cases they will require that the world as a whole shift production away from goods of which rela-

tively too much has been produced to goods of which too little is being produced.

There is nothing new or novel in what this requires in the field of international economic policy. It requires international agreement on the widest possible base for the reduction of prohibitive tariffs. It requires agreement for the elimination or progressive relaxation of quotas, export restrictions, and exchange controls, particularly where these are used as instruments of trade control. It requires that such measures of protection for domestic industry and agriculture as are retained shall be administered on a non-discriminatory basis. It requires that trade be again allowed to flow in response to conditions of economic advantage through the elimination of preferential systems and of bilateral trade arrangements. It requires that state monopolies shall not be used as instruments of trade diversion. It requires a recognition that export subsidies and two-price systems are as disruptive to international trade as are import restrictions. It requires that there be international cooperation for the maintenance of orderly exchange arrangements among countries, for the provision of short-term credits, and for the revival of international capital movements, and thus for the creation of conditions under which trade can begin to move more freely and payments can be made on a multilateral basis. It requires the development of resources and industries in less developed countries.

It is reasonably clear that there will be a disposition in few if any countries to wait for readjustments from wartime production to be brought about solely through the functioning of the price system. There is an increased insistence that high levels of employment and income can and must be sustained for peacetime needs as well as for the prosecution of war. There is also evident a general feeling that this goal will not be reached automatically but will require a considerable measure of public direction and assistance. The problem that this presents is whether these measures will be so conceived and administered as to reinforce each other and facilitate adjustment to a situation in which farms, mines, and factories can remain fully and efficiently employed; or whether the measures will be haphazard improvisations, heavily loaded with restrictions on production and trade, which make no fundamental contribution toward such adjustment and hence require the continued maintenance of the underpinning.



That these measures can be conceived so as to reinforce each other is nowhere better illustrated than in the approach which has in recent years been made to the problems of nutrition. Beginning particularly with the work of the Mixed Committee of the League of Nations, there has been an increased awareness of the adverse impact of agricultural protectionism on the quantity and quality of the diets of large segments of the population in many countries.

There has also been increased awareness of the contribution which national food programs could make, on the production side, to agricultural adjustment. This contribution is as significant internationally as it is domestically. Larger production of such foods as milk, vegetables, fruit, and meats, coupled with the fact that many of these need to be produced in areas near urban centers of consumption would afford greater opportunity for the areas best adapted for the production of energy foods. If, for example, the resources devoted to one fourth of the average wheat production in recent years in Europe, excluding the Soviet Union, could be diverted to the production of protective foods and to feed grains, and if that amount were added to the trade of the major wheat-exporting countries, international trade in wheat and flour would exceed its level in any previous peacetime year. A 25-percent reduction of output is of course a very substantial shift, but it would only carry European production back to roughly the 1926 level. As Denmark and the Netherlands demonstrated in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, such adjustments can be made and with profit to agricultural producers themselves.

In some respects, the immediate future offers a unique opportunity. Tremendous readjustments in production are going to have to be made in all of the leading countries. In industry these readjustments are of even greater magnitude than they will be in agriculture. It may be hoped that so far as national security is concerned, the nations will be disposed to seek a solution in international agreement for the maintenance of peace rather than in economic self-sufficiency behind trade barriers. There is also some reason to hope that many of the nations are rather thoroughly disillusioned as to the effectiveness of their trade-restrictive policies as means of promoting domestic prosperity. The tasks of reconstruction in war-devastated countries and the backlog of accumulated purchasing power in many other countries give a prospect of a high

level of production and employment for at least a time in Europe, in the United States, and in other industrial countries. Reconversion and reconstruction could, if there were desire and will and co-operation among nations, be more easily directed into rational lines in the immediate post-war years than has been true for at least a quarter of a century or may be true again for a long time to come. Some of these considerations are, it is true, more directly applicable to manufacturing than to agriculture. But a sustained level of industrial income will also tend to facilitate adjustment in agriculture and may prove to be politically prerequisite in some countries to the abandonment of subsidies, domestic price supports, two-price systems, guaranteed export prices and the other devices of governmental intervention which have developed in the United States and in many other countries and which are basically incompatible with international trade along lines of economic advantage and lines which will not generate international political friction.

At the same time, the immediate future will be a period with its own particular problems. Countries with difficult balance-of-payments positions arising out of the war and with great tasks of rehabilitation and reconstruction will be reluctant entirely to abandon controls over their foreign trade and foreign exchange. Countries which have greatly expanded their production, especially agricultural production, for war needs and for post-war relief will find it difficult rapidly to reduce that production and will feel impelled to maintain some floor under the incomes of their producers. There will be pressures to follow lines of least resistance and to minimize the immediate dimensions of reconversion and adjustment by keeping out imports on the one hand and subsidizing exports on the other.

These problems and the fears to which they give rise are real. They indicate the need for transitional measures as well as for long-term policies. Agreements for the demobilization of trade restrictions will have a greater prospect of acceptance if in some cases they provide for reductions by stages and if they include, under appropriate safeguards, provisions for emergency action to prevent the worsening of a seriously adverse balance-of-payments situation. The proposed financial institutions submitted by the Bretton Woods Conference will, if adopted, help to

(Continued on page 281)

# Wartime Visa-Control Procedure

By GRAHAM H. STUART<sup>1</sup>

## THE IMMIGRATION PROBLEM

It is recognized, as a basic principle, that a state in the absence of treaty obligations is under no duty to admit aliens to its territory. If a state admits aliens it does so in accordance with the dictates of its national interests. The United States, until recent years, has followed a very liberal immigration policy and has been open to all aliens who have been free from certain mental, physical, racial, or moral disabilities. The policy of restricting the number of immigrants to be received in a given year was an innovation resulting from the conditions in Europe at the end of the first World War.

As long as the sole limitations on immigrants were qualitative, in spite of an increasing series of restrictive provisions, the influx of aliens into the United States mounted rapidly. At the turn of the century about 450,000 aliens were being admitted annually. Five years later the number had reached a million, and by 1914, the year of the outbreak of the first World War, the number had climbed to about 1¼ million. Even during the four years of the first World War, in spite of the drastic limitation of transportation facilities, the United States admitted an average of over a quarter of a million immigrants annually.

At the end of the first World War a veritable flood of foreign immigrants threatened to engulf the United States. Congress, finally recognizing the urgent necessity of limiting drastically the number of aliens who could be admitted into the country, passed, on May 19, 1921, the first law restricting the total number of immigrants eligible to enter the United States in a given year. This is the so-called "quota system," and with certain substantial modifications it is still our basic law pertaining to numerical restriction.

## LIMITATION BY NUMBERS

The new approach to limitation of immigration by numbers necessitated a change in the handling

of the control. Where formerly little control was exercised abroad and the immigrant was often excluded from admission to the United States upon arrival, it was now found desirable to check immigration by the system of consular visas abroad.

The earliest provision for consular participation in a form of partial immigration control abroad was established by the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, but that act related solely to certain classes of persons of that race. The general practice of requiring all aliens, with certain exceptions, to obtain visas from consular officers abroad began as a war measure. According to instructions from the Department of State, dated April 17, 1917, followed by a joint order of the Departments of State and Labor dated July 26, 1917, consular and diplomatic officers were required to refuse visas to enemy aliens and to warn all other aliens applying if it appeared that they might be excluded under existing legislation. Subsequent legislation of May 22, 1918 and March 2, 1921 authorized diplomatic and consular officers to refuse visas to aliens whose entry into the United States appeared to be contrary to the public safety.

Although the act of May 19, 1921 established numerical limitation of immigrants by annual quotas, consular officers abroad could not exercise control with regard to numerical limitations of immigrants. They ceased to issue visas only when officially notified from the United States that a sufficient number of immigrants had been admitted at ports of entry to exhaust the quotas. The act of May 26, effective July 1, 1924, remedied that serious defect by giving the diplomatic or consular officers abroad the control of the quotas to be filled by means of immigration visas. Each quota nationality was assigned a fixed quota for the year and the issuance of immigration visas was limited to a maximum of 10 percent of the annual quota in any one month. The consular visa could be granted only after the consul had passed upon the eligibility of the alien under both the qualification tests and the allotted quota.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Stuart is head of the War Records Unit, Division of Research and Publication, Office of Public Information, Department of State.

### Definition of "Immigrant"

The term "immigrant" as used in the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended, means any alien departing from any place outside the United States destined for the United States, except (1) a government official, his family, attendants, servants, and employees, (2) an alien visiting the United States temporarily as a tourist or temporarily for business or pleasure, (3) an alien in continuous transit through the United States, (4) an alien lawfully admitted to the United States who later goes in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory, (5) a *bona fide* alien seaman serving as such on a vessel arriving at a port of the United States and seeking to enter temporarily the United States solely in the pursuit of his calling as a seaman, and (6) an alien entitled to enter the United States solely to carry on trade between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national under and in pursuance of the provisions of a treaty of commerce and navigation, and his wife, and his unmarried children under 21 years of age, if accompanying or following to join him.

### VISA DIVISION ESTABLISHED

The considerable additional work entailed by the control of immigration by consular visas required a corresponding effort in the Department of State. As originally established, the Visa Division was merely a section in the Bureau of Citizenship. The Section was set up as a Visa Office in the Division of Passport Control on August 13, 1918 and detached December 1, 1919 to be operated as a separate unit. A departmental order dated January 1, 1931 changed the Visa Office to the Visa Division.

Although it was the consul abroad who was made responsible for the proper administration of our immigration laws with respect to the issuance of visas, it was the Visa Division's function to advise the officers in the field on the interpretation of law in connection with questions which arose in the cases of individual aliens. That problem was increased materially during the period of the depression when it was found necessary to enforce the immigration laws realistically under a positive application of the provision in the act of 1917—classifying as inadmissible all aliens who were likely to become public charges in the light of unemployment conditions in the United States.

As might have been expected, that drastic restriction policy which reduced immigration to about 10 percent of the allotted quotas brought about protests on the part of interested parties in the United States. Not only did relatives and friends of disappointed aliens bombard consuls and the Visa Division with letters, but Members of Congress also took up cudgels in their behalf regardless of the fact that both consuls and the Department of State were merely enforcing a law that Congress itself had passed. The correspondence carried on by the Division in that connection was a difficult and thankless task.

From its establishment in 1918 until 1938, that is, during the first 20 years of the Division's existence, the staff increased very slowly. However, with the outbreak of the war in Europe in 1939, the size of the Division rapidly increased. In October 1940 there were 47 on the staff, of which 4 were Foreign Service officers. By July 1, 1941, when visa control was centralized in the Department of State, the staff had increased to 83.

### CENTRALIZATION OF VISA CONTROL IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

As a result of information received from American Foreign Service officers abroad to the effect that certain foreign governments were endeavoring to introduce agents into the United States in the guise of immigrants, visitors, or seamen, it was thought necessary in the interest of national security to exercise greater care in granting visas to prospective visitors or immigrants to the United States.

A circular telegram was sent on June 5, 1940 to American missions and consulates directing that all aliens seeking admission into the United States be examined with the greatest care. Particular attention was given to non-immigrants, and it was directed that a visa should be issued only when the applicant had conclusively established a legitimate purpose or reasonable need for his presence in the United States. He was required to specify what place he intended to visit in the United States and how long he would remain in each place. He must also, as formerly, present conclusive evidence that upon departing from the United States he would be readmitted into the country of his nationality, or to some other foreign country which he intended to visit.

The next step toward greater security was taken with the enactment in June 1940 of the Alien Reg-



istration Act, which required on and after August 27, 1940 the registration and fingerprinting not only of all aliens in the United States but the registration and fingerprinting in duplicate also of all aliens receiving visas of any kind abroad.<sup>1</sup>

With regard to control over foreign government officials coming to the United States, the act of July 1, 1940 provided that only those foreign officials who were accredited to the United States should thereafter be accorded "official" classification under section 3(1) of the act of 1924. Previously any foreign official whether or not accredited to the United States was given "official" status. Further, by a directive of September 20, 1940, no diplomatic or official visa for a foreign government official could be issued to a national of a continental European country without prior authorization of the Department.

The final step taken was to centralize all visa control in the Department of State. That policy had been considered on several occasions, but because of the large increase in staff required, action had been deferred. However, evidence of foreign attempts, notably Nazi, to infiltrate "tourists" and other agents called for action. On February 28, 1941 Assistant Secretary of State Berle recommended that, during the war, every visa application be referred to the Department. The Visa Division concurred and worked out the procedure.

A departmental order dated June 20, 1941 authorized the Visa Division to establish the new control. Under the regulations, effective July 1, 1941, every alien seeking permanent residence, temporary entry, or transit to a foreign destination, except native-born citizens of countries of the Western Hemisphere, officials of foreign governments, and seamen, were required to submit to the Visa Division of the Department of State a biographical statement and two affidavits of sponsorship.<sup>2</sup>

An Interdepartmental Advisory Committee would then check each case with regard to all available information on the visa applicant, including his sponsorship, the purpose of his entry into the United States, his attitude toward the American form of government, and his assurance of support in this country. Those committees under the chairmanship of a representative of the Visa

Division of the Department of State were composed of one representative each of the Immigration Service of the Department of Justice, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of the Military Intelligence Service, and of the Office of Naval Intelligence. Those Interdepartmental Committees were to consider the cases of visa applicants from the standpoint of national security.

After the cases were considered by the Visa Division, with the assistance of the Interdepartmental Committees, they were referred to the permit-issuing authority with appropriate recommendation for final consideration after careful examination of the applicants in the light of the information furnished by the Department. If the case still failed to meet the requirements of the law in the opinion of the permit-issuing authority, he was instructed to suspend action and present the facts to the Department for the further consideration by the Interdepartmental Committees.

Upon entry of the United States into the World War, in order to protect the security of the United States, it was now made illegal for an American citizen to leave the United States without a valid passport or for an alien to leave the United States without a valid permit to depart. It was further provided that no alien should be permitted to depart if it appeared to the Secretary of State that such a departure would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States.

The new regulations thus provided three additional functions for the Division relating to control over aliens: The issuance of *exit permits* for aliens (other than those coming within a few exempted classes) departing from the United States; a *formal review procedure* under which interested persons might appear before an Interdepartmental Review Committee on cases unfavorably recommended by a Primary Interdepartmental Committee; and an *Appeal Board* composed of two persons appointed by the President from outside the Government to review the record of cases rejected by a Review Committee.

This new procedure entailed a considerable increase in work in the Visa Division and a corresponding increase in the staff. Under the new arrangement not only was the control of the entry and departure of aliens centralized in the Visa Division of the Department of State, but the control of quotas formerly handled in 50 offices abroad was also handled in the Visa Division. In November 1941 the Visa Division had 179 employees; by

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of June 8, 1940, p. 620.

<sup>2</sup> BULLETIN of June 28, 1941, p. 764 and Aug. 28, 1943, p. 144.

June 30, 1942 the number had increased to 278. In spite of the large addition to the staff, the officers and clerks could carry on this work only by excessive overtime work. In fact, in the fiscal year July 1, 1941 to July 1, 1942, they worked 27,400 hours overtime.

In the month of August 1943 the Visa Division absorbed the Immigration Section of the Division of Communications and Records. That absorption involved the transfer of both functions and its personnel of 33. That change placed the files under direct control of the Visa Division, eliminated the duplication of records and searches, and reduced the time involved in finding the momentary location of cases under consideration.

The huge volume of work which reached its zenith in the early months of 1942 gradually decreased. With the entrance of the United States into the second World War, transportation facilities available to the traveler in times of peace were quickly transferred to war activities. New and more stringent regulations controlling the entrance of persons into the United States were issued. All direct immigration from enemy or enemy-occupied territory automatically ceased. The Division was also able to combine certain overlapping functions and simplify some of the more complicated procedures.

#### COMMITTEES FOR CONSIDERING VISA APPLICATION

A great amount of preliminary work on all visa applications is required before they go to the proper committee in the Visa Division for consideration and action. The Research and File Unit must investigate any application which refers to previous immigration cases. All applications are indexed in the Record Unit and are then sent to the Review Unit for careful examination regarding completeness and correctness. Many applications, as in the case of seamen, are given special procedures. Some are found to be exempt; others are clearly ineligible under the law or regulations. Sometimes more information is required before the case can be presented. Finally the preliminary application for visa in completed form goes to the Suspense File Unit, which sends out check sheets with a copy of the application to the five security agencies to report on the case.

Until April 1944 all visa applications which had been cleared by the Suspense File Unit went directly to one of the Primary Interdepartmental

Committees for consideration. Although the Interdepartmental Committee's sole function was to consider the applicant's case from the standpoint of his entry's being prejudicial to the public interest, the committee regularly considered many cases where no such element existed. The routing of such cases to the Interdepartmental Committees caused a considerable loss of their time and serious delays in acting upon the cases which did require careful consideration.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE

To simplify procedure and reduce the volume of work to be handled by the Interdepartmental Committees, the Department of State, after consultation with the Attorney General, set up a Special Committee to consider carefully every visa application and to refer to the Interdepartmental Committees only those cases on which the Interdepartmental Committees were required to express an opinion concerning the existence of evidence that the entry of the alien would be prejudicial to the public interest. In such cases when no adverse factors were apparent, the Special Committee was authorized to recommend to the Chief of the Visa Division that the permit-issuing authority which would receive the application should be informed that the Department had no objection to the issuance of an appropriate visa.

Where doubt of any sort existed as, for example, regarding the identity or the whereabouts of a person, the Special Committee requested an investigation through the office of the Chief Special Agent of the Department or through the appropriate intelligence agencies. If the investigation showed that the derogatory information did not apply to the applicant, the case was cleared. If, after the investigation, any doubt still remained that the derogatory information might apply, the case was then referred to a Primary Committee for consideration and decision.

The Special Committee was set up on May 11, 1944 and has functioned continuously since that time.<sup>1</sup> It consists of four officers of the Visa Division, under the chairmanship of a Foreign Service officer. It passes upon about 50 visa applications daily, and, according to its records up-to-date, about 40 percent of those examined are cleared and therefore do not have to go to the Interdepartmental Committees.

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of May 20, 1944, p. 490.



As an adjunct to or as a part of the Special Committee work, it has been found necessary to give certain cases exceptional treatment. For example, a case which has previously been approved sometimes has to be reopened, particularly one dealing with applications for visitors' visas for businessmen. Although considered as an entirely new case, a more expeditious treatment is sometimes justified. In the same way cases approved for immigration visas in which for some reason the applicant has not been able to take advantage of the entry permission accorded, but finds it possible to do so later, have to be rechecked before the approval may be renewed.

Sometimes cases require urgent action because of business or medical reasons. Some of these cases have a semi-diplomatic character. For example, a former Minister of a friendly power wished to bring with him to Washington his Italian chauffeur. As an alien enemy without diplomatic status the chauffeur's application normally would be subject to a lengthy procedure in which the contract-labor clause might be involved. As a gesture of good-will a quick check of intelligence files was made and the case was cleared immediately by the summary procedure which the Department employs in emergency cases. Another type of case which is fairly prevalent is the transit visa, which easily lends itself to expeditious treatment.

In those special cases the Department acts promptly and directly. The officer charged with expediting such cases assumes full responsibility for recommending to the Chief of the Division such action as he deems proper. The case then goes to the permit-issuing authority, where the final action on the visa can be taken within a very brief time following the original application. The normal procedure would take possibly several months.

#### PRIMARY COMMITTEES

An application for an immigration visa which is not cleared by the Special Committee is brought to one of the Primary Interdepartmental Committees. The Primary Committees are composed of one representative each from the State Department, the Military Intelligence Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Naval Intelligence, and the United States Immigration Service, the State Department's representative serving as chairman. The function of the

Although the United States did not require visas on alien passports prior to the first World War, certain other states had for many years required that formality of Americans. In 1889 the Turkish Minister at Washington notified the Secretary of State that passports of travelers visiting Turkey must be visaed by an Ottoman consular officer. The State Department issued a notice in 1901 that all persons entering Russia must have a passport visaed by a Russian diplomatic or consular official. By the beginning of the twentieth century, however, except for the countries of the Far East and Near East, both passports and visas had become almost obsolete.

In the post-war period practically every state required an alien entering its territory to have a passport visaed by its consul. Those restrictions and the charges entailed made traveling both onerous and expensive. In fact the handicap to travel was so great that the League of Nations held two conferences, one in 1920, and another in 1926, to try to eliminate the worst features of the passport nuisance. Although costs have been somewhat reduced, the visa system is still a very burdensome restriction upon travel. According to figures issued by the United States Passport Bureau in 1933 before the United States depreciated the dollar, an American planning to visit Europe and the Near East, stopping in Great Britain, France, Poland, Austria, Hungary, Belgium, Greece, Rumania, Spain, Portugal, Egypt, and Turkey, would have to expend \$10 for his passport and about \$60 for visas.

Primary Committee is to consider the facts presented for an advisory opinion regarding the effect that the entry of the applicant would have on the safety of the United States. The principal reasons for negative action on the part of the committee considering the case are based upon part 58 of the regulations of November 19, 1941, as amended, regarding aliens entering the United States. One section of the regulations lists the various types of aliens whose entry is deemed prejudicial to the public interest, such as Nazis, Fascists, communists, spies, saboteurs, fifth columnists, and alien enemies. Another section provides that aliens leaving close relatives in certain foreign countries unfriendly to the United States are possibly unsuitable for admission into the United States at the present time if other unfavorable factors also exist.

The information received by any of the security agencies is read to the committee by its representa-



tive, after which each member of the committee considers the information given and individually decides whether the applicant is admissible. A majority vote in a favorable sense for any alien not a native of an enemy country is final regarding security provisions unless the minority votes an appeal. A negative majority on any case requires submission of the case automatically to the Review Committee. All cases of aliens from enemy countries must go automatically before a Review Committee. The Primary Committee makes a favorable report, which is final upon approximately one third of the cases heard.

In the first seven months of its work, that is from July 1, 1941 until January 31, 1942, the Primary Committees considered 22,100 cases, of which 14,100 were approved, 5,200 disapproved, and 2,800 deferred. The work in 1942 increased to such an extent that in May 1942, six Primary Committees were functioning. The two Review Committees aided from time to time. In that one month 3,017 cases were considered. By the first of September 1942, the work had decreased to such an extent that three Primary Committees were able to pass upon all the cases presented, which averaged under a thousand monthly. In March 1943 there was another increase requiring three Primary Committees to pass upon over 1,000 cases. By the end of 1943 the average had dropped to about 600. Since February 1, 1944, only one Primary Committee has functioned, although in March 1944 the Review Committees were brought in to assist. The total number of cases for April 1944 was about 600, involving 1,200 persons.

#### REVIEW COMMITTEES

The Interdepartmental Review Committees are composed of one State Department official as chairman and, like the Primary Committees, of officers furnished by the Military Intelligence Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Naval Intelligence, and the United States Immigration Service. The function of the Review Committee is primarily to hear the testimony of witnesses appearing in behalf of aliens in order to supply information and to give evidence regarding the cases under consideration. On the basis of the testimony, the documentation, and the facts presented, the committees render advisory opinions.

The procedure in the Review Committee is somewhat similar to that of the Primary Committee. Before hearing a sponsor or witness in a case, the dossier of the applicant is brought in and all relevant information is presented by the committee members and discussed. The various members of the committee hear and examine the witness. The committee takes a vote to determine whether the admission of the alien would be prejudicial in any way to the security of the United States. The judgment of the committee is based largely upon the regulations regarding aliens entering the United States.

The Review Committee passes upon all cases of enemy aliens and upon all other cases which have been reported adversely by a Primary Committee. Generally speaking, the Review Committee sustains the action of the Primary Committee. It is estimated that only 10 to 15 percent of cases which have received an adverse vote in the Primary Committee will receive a favorable vote in the Review Committee.

During the year 1942 from five to six Review Committees worked constantly, hearing from 1,000 to 1,400 cases monthly. Of these cases the committees disapproved from two to three times as many cases as they approved. For example, a report for the month of September 1942 discloses the following results:

Enemy aliens approved . . . . .	121
Others approved . . . . .	155
Disapproved . . . . .	800
Withdrawn . . . . .	32

TOTAL CASES CONSIDERED . . . . . 1,108

In September of 1943 occurred a considerable decrease in the number of cases presented with only two Review Committees functioning, but the ratio remains about the same:

Enemy aliens approved . . . . .	64
Others approved . . . . .	88
Disapproved . . . . .	287
Withdrawn . . . . .	17

TOTAL CASES CONSIDERED . . . . . 456

At the present time two Interdepartmental Review Committees are able to hear all the cases which are sent on from the Primary Committees.

#### THE BOARD OF APPEALS ON VISA CASES

The Board of Appeals on visa cases is the last consultative body which may pass upon the case

in reference to the security aspect of the applicant's entrance into the United States. The Board was appointed on December 3, 1941 as an evaluative rather than as an investigative agency. It was expected to take cognizance of all the factors to which consideration should be given in visa applications and to clarify by its findings the general policies of the procedure. The two classes of cases where the Board could best exercise its judgment, and was therefore given jurisdiction, were, first, those cases decided adversely by the Review Committee and, secondly, all cases involving enemy aliens. In those cases the Board might reverse the findings of the Review Committees on the ground that the rules and principles were applied too strictly in individual cases, in that sufficient consideration had not been given to broad consideration of national policy, or that lack of uniformity had developed in the findings of the several Review Committees.

The procedure of the Board of Appeals is very informal. No hearings are held. The findings are based upon the written record from the Review Committees. The dossier of each case comes to the office staff, which makes a careful summary of the material elements and a tentative recommendation regarding the disposition of the case. The dossiers go separately to both members of the Board of Appeals, and each writes an opinion. In complicated cases or cases which involve the reversal of a Review Committee recommendation, both members of the Board and the alternate must give unanimous approval. In these doubtful cases the Board of Appeals meets with the law officer, who is the alternate member. All three members discuss each case, and, unless unanimous agreement is reached, the case is remanded to the Interdepartmental Committee for further information or further consideration.

The Board of Appeals, in its action, tends to open rather than close the door to the alien seeking admission. In fact, its decisions reverse the findings of the Review Committee in a favorable direction in from 20 to 25 percent of the cases considered. In all cases where the Board reverses a unanimous adverse finding of the Review Committee, an opinion is written by one member of the Board.

The Board of Appeals' task has been a heavy one. For the first half of 1942 the Board passed upon approximately 500 cases a month, but by

the end of the year it was considering over a thousand cases monthly. In September of 1942, a representative month, the Board passed upon 1,021 cases, of which it affirmed 777, reversed 274, and remanded 10. The work for 1943 was not quite so heavy, and the report for September of 1943 reveals that the Board considered 369 cases, affirming 268, reversing 98, and remanding 3. Since 1942 the Board of Appeals has rarely considered more than 500 cases in any one month.

In its first report to the President made on November 9, 1942, the Board noted the fact that from its appointment in December 1941 through October 1942 it had passed upon 6,152 applications for visas.<sup>1</sup> Of these applicants the Board had approved the recommendation of the Review Committee in 4,683 cases; had reversed the Review Committee's recommendation in 1,334 cases, and had remanded 135 cases for further inquiry. Of the reversals it should be noted that only in the rarest instance does the reversal work to keep out an applicant. The overwhelming majority of reversals are in favor of the applicant's admission. In fact 157 of the cases noted above were reversals in which the Board's recommendation that the visa be granted had found no support either in the Primary or Review Committees.

According to that report the Board bases its reversals on what the Board believes to be errors of fact, errors of omission, or errors of interpretation. The errors of fact occur most frequently with reference to whether the applicant is or is not an enemy alien. Europe's jumbled geographical status since the war makes such errors easily possible. Errors of omission involve documents in the record apparently overlooked which appear to be of significance to the Board. Errors of interpretation involve the significance of the various items of information to be found in each record, the light which each throws upon the basic questions of safety and benefit to the United States, and an approximation of the weight to be given to the record as a whole.

As originally constituted, the Board of Appeals consisted of Mr. Robert J. Bulkley, former United States Senator from Ohio, Dr. Frederick P. Keppel, President of the Carnegie Corporation, and Dean F. D. G. Ribble of the University of Virginia Law School, as alternate. Upon the death of Dr.

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Dec. 5, 1942, p. 982.

Keppel in 1943, Judge Milton J. Helmick, formerly of the United States Court of China was appointed. Dr. Robert Gooch, Professor of Political Science in the University of Virginia, was appointed in May 1944 as alternate in the place of Dean Ribble, who now serves in another capacity in the Department of State.

On the whole the interdepartmental visa-review procedure has worked well. Under it an opportunity is given to interested persons to appear at a hearing before a committee on behalf of visa applicants, and provision is made for a final review of advisory recommendations by a Board of Appeals unconnected with any of the departments participating in the procedure.

## Exchange of American and German Nationals

[Released to the press September 8]

The State Department and the War Department announce that the M.S. *Gripsholm* arrived at Göteborg, Sweden, Thursday afternoon, September 7, to carry out a further exchange with Germany of disabled prisoners of war and protected personnel entitled to repatriation under the terms of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention and the Geneva Red Cross Convention. The exchange of personnel is scheduled to take place September 8.

The M.S. *Gripsholm* carried to Göteborg seriously sick and seriously wounded German prisoners of war and surplus protected personnel who have been held in the United States and Canada, as well as prisoner-of-war mail and cargo consisting of relief supplies for American prisoners of war and civilian internees held in Germany.

Next of kin of the American repatriates will receive notification as soon as possible after the identity of the repatriates has been established beyond the possibility of doubt. Arrangements have been made to enable repatriates to communicate with their friends and relatives at the earliest possible moment.

It is expected that the *Gripsholm* will arrive at New York late in September with American and Canadian repatriates after having stopped at a port in the United Kingdom.

Arrangements for the repatriation operation were concluded between the United States and German Governments through the Swiss Government. The Swiss Government has placed a representative aboard the *Gripsholm* to act as a neutral observer and has made arrangements for a Swiss representative to travel with American repatriables between Germany and Göteborg.

The exchange is taking place on Swedish territory with the consent and cooperation of the Swedish Government, which has offered to appoint an umpire for the exchange operation.

Representatives of the International Red Cross Committee and the interested National Red Cross societies have been active and helpful in arrangements for the exchange operation.

The Governments of the British Commonwealth and the German Government have agreed to repatriate disabled prisoners of war, protected personnel, and civilians at the same time and place. The British Government is sending two vessels to Göteborg carrying German prisoners of war and German civilian internees. No civilian internees will be included in the American repatriation operation.

## Brazilian Independence Day

### MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

[Released to the press September 7]

The President has sent the following message to the President of the United States of Brazil, His Excellency Getulio Vargas, on the occasion of the Brazilian Independence Day:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
September 7, 1944.

The celebration of Brazil's Independence Day comes at a particularly happy time this September of 1944. On this third anniversary of Independence Day since Brazil's courageous decision to join the forces fighting for the freedom of mankind, our goal of total defeat of the Axis Powers is within sight of realization. I am happy to convey to Your Excellency and through you to the Brazilian people, the congratulations and fraternal salutations of the people of the United States on this auspicious anniversary.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT



# The American Foreign Service in Tropical Africa

By PERRY N. JESTER<sup>1</sup>

The important work of the American Foreign Service in connection with the foreign relations of this country is not concentrated

entirely in the great capitals of the world which are so frequently in the limelight of public events. In fact, the interests abroad of the American Government and its citizens are so diversified in nature and extent that one may safely say the majority of the day-to-day problems connected with those interests is handled by the smaller consulates and missions throughout the world where both in peacetime and in war Foreign Service officers strive, often under difficult and trying conditions, to keep the Government informed of developments which affect American interests, to enforce applicable American laws, and to carry out American foreign policies.

The consulates in tropical Africa are typical of the important and strategic outposts which must be maintained for those purposes. The term "outposts" is sometimes used to describe them, since those offices do not, in the main, function under the direct supervision of an embassy or legation as would be the case in Europe. They are in direct contact with the Department of State, and for that reason many officers prefer them despite unattractive, difficult living conditions. Such officers have the opportunity of dealing individually with the full range of this Government's interest regarding the territory of their jurisdiction instead of with some small segment of the work as would be the case in a large mission or consulate general in another country.

Since the invasion of North Africa, American officers at Dakar have been concerned with the procurement and requirement programs in French West Africa and with the development of the military air routes which have passed through Dakar en route to destinations farther to the east. American officers at Dakar have also been concerned with the future of American trade interests in French West Africa.

*A tribute to the American Foreign Service officers in tropical Africa who are performing successfully their many wartime duties dealing with various economic controls, lend-lease operations, and detailed surveys of economic requirements.*

The American Legation at Monrovia has been occupied with many new problems arising from the participation of Liberia in

the war and the stationing of American troops in that country as a part of our defense effort.<sup>2</sup> The development of strategic air routes to and from West Africa has involved the creation of important seaplane and land-plane terminals in Liberia. These facilities will be of increasing importance and value to American interests in the post-war period. The increasing production of rubber in Liberia by American interests has also created many problems which currently require the attention of that Legation.

The Consulate at Accra, Gold Coast Colony, in conjunction with representatives of the Foreign Economic Administration, has been concerned with the procurement of important strategic materials in the Gold Coast and with many time-consuming duties in connection with the large-scale air traffic, both passenger and freight, which has been constantly channelized through the air terminal at that outpost. Although that air traffic is principally in the hands of the Air Transport Command of the United States Army, it nevertheless involves considerable activity on the part of that Consulate.

The Consulate General in Lagos, Nigeria, is the supervisory office for all official American interests other than military in the four colonies of British West Africa. It has been concerned also with important procurement programs in the Colony of Nigeria, with certain duties in connection with the supplying of the requirements of that colony, and with lend-lease activities. That office performs numerous services for several hundred American citizens resident in its district and to-

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Jester is a Foreign Service officer formerly Consul at Lagos, Nigeria, West Africa, now detailed to the Division of African Affairs, Office of Eastern and African Affairs, Department of State.

<sup>2</sup> BULLETIN of July 23, 1944, p. 102.

gether with the Consulate at Accra it prepares reports of considerable value on present and future trends, both political and economic, in that part of the world.

The Consulate General at Brazzaville maintains contact with the colonial government of French Equatorial Africa and with its economic and social development programs for that territory. It also performs numerous services for American citizens resident in that area and is concerned with the dissemination of information about the United States designed to reach French-speaking people in various parts of the world by means of the Brazzaville radio.

The Consulate General at Léopoldville, Belgian Congo, is perhaps the most important American outpost in tropical Africa. A ranking Foreign Service officer is now in charge. In conjunction with representatives of the Foreign Economic Administration that office is actively engaged in procurement programs of strategic materials in the Belgian Congo; and in cooperation with the Belgians and with the British, it determines and controls the supply program for that large and important area. The future of American interests of all kinds in central Africa is under constant review by the officers stationed at Léopoldville.

The Consulates at Luanda, Angola, and Beira, Mozambique, and the Consulate General at Lourenço Marques, Mozambique, are active in the operation of sisal procurement programs in those two Portuguese colonies and also in the matter of supplies needed for the maintenance of the civil economy of those areas. Those Consulates, furthermore, perform numerous services for American citizens resident in those Colonies, as well as for other official American representatives who are temporarily stationed at those places in connection with various phases of the war effort. Since they are in neutral territories in which Germans and Italians reside, those offices participate in Proclaimed List work and other activities designed to minimize the economic support which our enemies might obtain from such territories.

The Consulate at Mombasa, Kenya, and the Consulate General at Nairobi are both active in the sisal and pyrethrum<sup>1</sup> procurement programs in British East Africa including Tanganyika and

in the search for and production in that area of several strategic metals. War Shipping Administration activities on the east coast of Africa are assisted by the Consulate at Mombasa, which is also in constant liaison with the British Naval Headquarters at that port. The Consulate General at Nairobi maintains contact with the British East African Military Command, which at present controls the British and Italian Somaliland territories and Eritrea. The varied political and economic scene in East Africa, which includes developments that may be of considerable interest in the future to the United States, is under constant review by those two offices.

The American Legation at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, is active in connection with the program of Emperor Haile Selassie for the future economic development of that newly liberated country, in which American interests may be concerned to an important degree.

Whatever our interests may be in any of those territories, whether of short-term war importance or of long-term economic and political value, our officers are there to maintain the necessary working relationships with governing officials, to assist the operations of other Government agencies and of private interests, to study and analyze current trends and developments, and to take an active part in the promotion and protection of American foreign trade regarding both markets for our exports and access to the raw materials of that continent.

In times of peace American officers at those posts must struggle not only against the psychological handicap of a sense of frustration in being so far removed from the more active currents of world affairs to which must always be added the physical strain resulting from the enervating heat and humidity of tropical regions: Disease and illness are ever-present dangers which require constant vigilance; insect pests of all kinds including the dread malarial mosquito never relent in their attack.

The amenities of life which characterize the large cities of other continents are frequently lacking in those relatively undeveloped areas of Africa, but on the other hand there are compensations which arise particularly from one's sense of being engaged in important and vital work for one's country and countrymen and from pleas-

<sup>1</sup> A plant used mainly for the manufacture of insecticide.

ant associations in the social life of the European communities of those outposts.

The impact of the war on the far-away African posts has intensified the usual demands made on the officers in those colonies. The pioneering of the American Air Transport Command in laying down air routes across that continent and in constructing air fields and installations and the subsequent procession across the scene of high-ranking officials and other important persons has called for the assistance of American representatives in countless new ways. In all of these new and stirring developments American Foreign Service officers have acquitted themselves well and have brought great credit to the Service. The war has created many new problems to claim their attention in the form of various economic controls, lend-lease operations, and detailed surveys of the economic requirements of each of the territories that make up that part of tropical Africa.

In the background there is always the unfolding development of the colonial policies of the powers exercising sovereignty. In the warp and woof of those growing forces run the threads of American interests, and it is the vital, challenging task of the Foreign Service officers to detect the pattern and delineate the shape of this Nation's concern with those portents of the future. Their days may not be filled with dramatic incidents of world importance; their environment may lack the color and pageantry of the age-old civilizations of other areas. Their job, however, is no less important to the American Government and people, nor is it less satisfying in actual accomplishment than are the assignments of those officers who labor in the more highly organized offices of the great capitals.

STINEBOWER—Continued from page 270

justify confidence that the pattern of trade can begin to rebuild itself on a multilateral basis without subjecting some countries to severe deflationary effects. With proper safeguards, commodity arrangements may be useful devices for orderly transition out of distress situations and not merely a means for the maintenance of prices and the perpetuation of unbalance. What is important is that such transition measures as are needed should be designed in connection with

longer-run policies and so directed as to hasten the transition. Even so, they will need constant scrutiny, for the experience of countries which have embarked upon trade controls, trade diversion, commodity agreements, and other restrictive devices under the plea of emergency need bears eloquent witness to the fact that such devices tend to create their own justification for continuance. Emergencies may change their nature or their label but they seldom pass.

Piecemeal approaches brought us close to economic chaos once before. If the various measures which are taken to speed the transition from an economy geared to war needs to a peacetime economy and to maintain stability in an expanding world economy are to fit together and reinforce each other, there will be needed a clear concept of the pattern of the goals sought and of the manner in which each measure is designed to contribute to that pattern. Otherwise we and other countries are likely to find ourselves resorting once again to makeshift devices to bolster up and alleviate particular conditions of distress, in what someone has called "a scurrying hither and thither in chase of the unapprehended consequences of ill-considered actions".

## Theodore P. Dykstra Returns From China

[Released to the press September 6]

Dr. Theodore P. Dykstra of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture, has just returned from China, where he served for 20 months with the Chinese Government under the Department of State's cultural-cooperation program.

While in China Dr. Dykstra worked with the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in the developing of a national potato-production and research program. During his stay in China Dr. Dykstra traveled in the central, southwest, and northwestern provinces of China. Although rice is the principal popular food product in China, Dr. Dykstra points out that the Irish potato provides the main diet for approximately 50 percent of the population in the northwestern provinces, and in recent years its popularity has been growing all over China.



Dr. Dykstra is very enthusiastic about the cooperation he received from the Chinese Ministry of Agriculture and the officials of the National Agricultural Research Bureau. He feels assured that a sound potato industry will be developed in China and that this will contribute greatly toward increasing food production in that country for the benefit of the Chinese people.

## Visit of Mexican Authority On Indian Affairs

[Released to the press September 9]

Dr. Manuel Gamio of Mexico, director of the Inter-American Indian Institute, is a guest of the Department of State while conferring on Indian Affairs with Government officials and specialists in the field. Dr. Gamio is interested especially in obtaining data for the statistical census of Indians throughout the Americas which is being compiled by the Institute. He says that it is a surprising fact that there have never been any reliable figures on the total number of American Indians at any period of history, including the present, nor for any given country, including our own. The United States has the best information on the subject, he states, although even in this country such factors as the dropping of Indian names and the adoption of English as the language of the home have caused many Indians not to be classified according to race.

Dr. Gamio made a similar tour of four of the other American republics earlier this year, visiting Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, and Brazil. He expresses especial admiration for the work of the Brazilian Government with relation to Indian affairs.

In addition to its work of research and investigation, the Inter-American Indian Institute is concerned with the problem of improving living conditions among the Indians. In Mexico the Institute has completed the study of a typical Indian village in all its aspects; is carrying on a public-health campaign with especial emphasis on curing the Indians of hookworm, a widespread affliction; and is attempting to raise the nutritional standard of the Indian diet. An interesting feature of the last-named measure is the

increasing popularization of the soybean. Dr. Gamio says that it is being used in the form of soy-bean milk and curd, and even more widely as an ingredient of the tortilla, principal item of the Indian's diet.

## Visit of Judge Venturino Of Chile

[Released to the press September 9]

The Honorable Pascual Venturino, a judge in the court at Antofagasta, Chile, is observing the organization of juvenile courts and child-welfare services while visiting this country as a guest of the Department of State. The Chilean Government has requested Judge Venturino to make a report, with recommendations, on his findings. His interest in the welfare of children and in the problems of labor has resulted in two books, on the legal organization of the family and on man as a factor in production, respectively. Before assuming his present post at Antofagasta, Judge Venturino was on the faculty of the Sociology Department of the University of Chile at Santiago.

While in Washington he is interested especially in observing the functioning of the Supreme Court and in visiting its library and the Library of Congress. Another of his official missions is to examine collections of books on medical jurisprudence with the purpose of making a recommended list of such works for translation into Spanish.

Although this is his first visit to an English-speaking country, Judge Venturino speaks the language fluently. He explained his proficiency by saying, "I have been preparing for 20 years for this trip to the United States!"

## PUBLICATIONS

### OTHER AGENCIES

Foreign War Relief Operations: Communication from the President of the United States transmitting a cumulative report of the American Red Cross of refugee and foreign war relief operations from July 1, 1940, through April 30, 1944. S. Doc. 228, 78th Cong. VIII, 85 p.

## THE DEPARTMENT

### Functions of the International Information Division<sup>1</sup>

*Purpose.* Departmental Order 1218 of January 15, 1944 and Departmental Order 1229 of February 21, 1944 describe the functions of the Motion Picture and Radio Division of the Office of Public Information in broad and general terms. This new Departmental Order is intended to change the name of the Motion Picture and Radio Division and to clarify its functions and activities.

1 *Change in title.* The name of the Motion Picture and Radio Division is hereby changed to the International Information Division.

2 *Functions of the International Information Division.* The International Information Division shall have responsibility for the initiation and coordination of policy and programs in respect to the Department of State's interest and participation in dissemination overseas of information through the media of films, radio and certain publications.\* This includes the development and furtherance of international film, radio, and publications programs (other than books and specialized periodicals), advising on foreign policy aspects of the overseas information programs of other Federal agencies, particularly the war agencies, and advisory liaison with private organizations and industries on international information problems.

The major functions of the Division are:

(a) Initiation and formulation of over-all policy of the Department regarding the role and scope of official overseas information programs and projects of the Government in the conduct of United States foreign relations.

(b) Initiation and development of the Department's program of overseas information services, by means of films, radio broadcasts, and publica-

tions and publications materials (other than books and specialized periodicals which are handled by the Division of Cultural Cooperation).

(c) Advising and cooperating with officials of other Government agencies, particularly war agencies such as the Office of War Information and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, in planning and developing overseas information programs, and on the relationship of these programs and activities to United States foreign policy.

(d) Development, in cooperation with appropriate geographic and other Offices of the Department, and issuance of instructions to United States foreign service establishments regarding the Department's overseas information policies.

(e) Preparation, in collaboration with other agencies, of operational and other instructions to United States foreign service establishments carrying on informational programs in countries where the Office of War Information and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs have no representation.

(f) Participation in development of policy recommendation regarding transitional and post-war overseas informational activities.

(g) Participation on interdepartmental and intergovernmental committees and in international conferences concerned with the content and informational use of international informational media.

(h) Advisory liaison with commercial and other private organizations and interests within the field of the Division's responsibilities for foreign policy aspects of overseas informational activities.

(i) The official attestation of the international educational character of documentary films.

(j) Cooperation with the Division of International Conferences in planning and arranging for appropriate motion picture, radio and related presentations at international conferences and meetings.

(k) Liaison with the office of the Special Assistant on press matters in relating the operations of

<sup>1</sup> Departmental Order 1285, dated Aug. 31, 1944; effective Sept. 1, 1944.

\*Note: Nothing in this order alters the informational activities of the Office of Special Assistant on press matters as provided in Departmental Order 1229 of February 21, 1944. [Note in the original.]

the International Information Division to current press and psychological warfare activities.

(l) Preparation and maintenance of instructions to the Foreign Service establishments for comprehensive and interpretive reporting on overseas information activities.

(m) Collaboration with the Office of the Foreign Service in evaluating and making recommendations regarding staffing needs in Foreign Service establishments to implement effectively the programs of the Division.

3 *Relationship of the Division to other Divisions.* In carrying out its responsibilities, the International Information Division shall work in close collaboration with other Divisions of the Department, particularly the geographic Divisions, the Division of Cultural Cooperation, the Office of the Foreign Service and the Telecommunications Division which shall continue to handle in cooperation with the appropriate divisions the commercial aspects of motion pictures.

4 *Routing symbol.* The routing symbol of the International Information Division shall be INI.

CORDELL HULL

AUGUST 31, 1944.

### Appointment of Officers

John M. Begg as Chief of the International Information Division, effective September 1, 1944.

Forrest H. Kirkpatrick as Consultant on Personnel Administration, effective July 5, 1944.

Andrew B. Foster as Executive Assistant to Assistant Secretary Shaw, effective September 1, 1944.

John Parke Young as Adviser on International Financial Institutions in the Division of Financial and Monetary Affairs, effective August 16, 1944.

Frank W. Fetter as Adviser on British Commonwealth Financial Affairs in the Division of Financial and Monetary Affairs, effective August 16, 1944.

John T. Forbes as Executive Officer of the Office of American Republic Affairs, effective September 1, 1944.

John W. Carrigan as Chief of the Division of Mexican Affairs, effective September 1, 1944.

Ruth Bacon as Adviser in the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, effective September 1, 1944.

Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., as Executive Officer of the Office of European Affairs, effective August 25, 1944.

## TREATY INFORMATION

### Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic

#### Nicaragua

The Director General of the Pan American Union informed the Secretary of State by a letter of September 1, 1944 of the deposit with the Pan American Union on August 31, 1944 of the instrument of ratification by the Government of Nicaragua of the Convention on the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union on December 15, 1943. The instrument of ratification is dated July 18, 1944.

### Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences

[Released to the press September 8]

The Convention on the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington on January 15, 1944 and was signed on that day on the part of the United States, was proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1944. In accordance with the provision in article XV of the convention that the convention shall enter into force three months after the deposit of at least five ratifications, the convention will enter into force on November 30, 1944.

Instruments of ratification of the convention have been deposited with the Pan American Union by the following countries: The United States of America on July 4, 1944; El Salvador on May 31, 1944; Guatemala on July 6, 1944; Costa Rica on August 14, 1944; and Nicaragua on August 31, 1944.

## LEGISLATION

Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, 78th Congress, 2d session, on S. 1478, S. 1609, S. 1680, S. 1775, S. 1794, S. 1803, S. 1815, S. 2045, S. 2065: Part 13, Utilization and disposition of surplus war property. Appendix: Letters from government agencies. [Department of State p. 911] ill, pp. 887-947.



Amending the Nationality Act of 1940. S. Rept. 1073, on H. R. 1680, 78th Cong. [Favorable report.] 2 pp.

Amending Section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 In Respect to Certain Naturalization Fees. S. Rept. 1074, on H. R. 3722 78th Cong. [Favorable report.] 2 pp.

Amending the Nationality Act of 1940 To Preserve the Nationality of United States Citizens Residing Abroad. S. Rept. 1077, on H. R. 4271, 78th Cong. [Favorable report.] 2 pp.